

Note-to-File

16 September 2014

Waiver for postponing PAC – Fiji Governance Programme Initiation Plan

Approved 

TO: Osnat Lubrani, Resident Representative, UNDP Fiji MCO

From: Akiko Fujii, Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP Fiji MCO



Background:

Fiji is holding elections in September 2014 for the first time in 8 years after the military coup in 2006. The expected political transition to democracy presents an immense opportunity for UNDP's expanded programme support for Fiji towards deepening democracy. A two-week scoping mission, assisted by APRC BKK in August 2014, recommended a set of actions to position UNDP Fiji MCO, including conducting a Democratic Governance Analysis soon after the election. The Initiation Plan was drafted based on the outcome recommendations of the scoping mission and subsequent stakeholder meetings.

Justification for seeking a waiver for not holding a PAC with the Fiji Government Coordinating Agency and Implementing Partner until the new elected government is in place and governance assessment is completed:

Due to the nature of the current Fiji military government, UNDP Fiji MCO has encountered repeated challenges in obtaining agreements on UNDP projects, particularly in the area of Governance and human rights. The decision making procedures in the government are unclear and lack transparency, with only a few individuals holding the decision making powers. Pending the election results, we felt it would be wise not to define an Implementing Partner at this point, until we can conduct a proper assessment after the election and political stability is regained. Under this circumstance, we request that an Initiation Plan be authorized without a PAC with the government coordinating agency and Implementing Partner, so we will be able to conduct initial strategic activities to position UNDP Fiji MCO in a timely manner.

Risk mitigation:

The Initiation Plan has benefited from two stakeholders meetings and an internal PAC (minutes are attached). The relevant government ministries and entities were invited, but not many government ministries attended mainly due to the busy schedules before the election. The Initiation Plan will be implemented in close coordination with and with support from UNDP HQ, APRC, PC and other UN agencies. The Democratic Governance Analysis will be used to gauge the risks as well as the UNDP entry points and a tool for coordination among development partners. A PAC will be conducted as soon as the political situation allows a legitimate representation by the government with political stability to address governance and human rights priorities, and a governance analysis is conducted.

Programme Appraisal Committee (PAC) Meeting

Fiji Governance Programme - Initiation Plan

Venue: UNDP Conference Room, Level 8, Kadavu House, Suva, Fiji

Time: 11'30am – 1pm, Friday 12 September 2014

In attendance:

1. Akiko Fujii (attended the discussion on monitoring and management arrangement)
2. Asenaca Ravuvu, Assistant Resident Representative – Programme
3. Elena Wakolo, Assistant Resident Representative – Operations
4. Dyfan Jones, Parliamentary Development Specialist, Pacific Centre
5. Janet Murdock, CPR Programme Specialist, Pacific Centre
6. Patrick Tuimalealiifano, OIC –Democratic Governance & Resilience Building
7. Mohammed Mozeem, Governance Analyst
8. Emma Mario, Sustainable Development Programme Analyst
9. Ruth Verevukivuki, Results and Resources Management
10. Luisa Fesaitu, Results and Resources Management
11. Sandeep Prasad, Results and Resources Management
12. Ruci Yauvoli, Programme Associate, Democratic Governance & Resilience Building
13. Floyd Robinson, Programme Associate
14. Ulla Hellena Gronlund, Programme Officer, UNV
15. Tomoko Kashiwazaki, Communication and advocacy, UNV

I. Opening by Asenaca with clarifications as follows:

- This PAC meeting was convened for the project as Initiation Plan.
- Different modalities require different processes, mechanisms, staff and monitoring of the project. The modality has to be decided also taking into account the sensitive political environment.
- An Initiation Plan (IP) is part of a full project proposal. A full project proposal needs to be provided identifying activities of the IP as a small part of it.
- Sensitivities of the current situation in Fiji bears significant implications on modality of IP vs Engagement Facility (EF). PAC will review pros and cons of two modalities, Initiation Plan or Engagement Facility and make recommendations to the senior management team for its decision.

	Initiation Plan	Engagement Facility
Project period	Project period has to be set and has to fall within 1 year as per Initiation Plan guideline	Flexible in project period. This project could be extended till end of 2015.
Project document	IRRF, management arrangement, risk log required.	Only concept note with AWP is required as project document.
Initiation process	LPAC and approval by the Government are required, which has a risk of delaying the process.	LPAC is not necessary, approval by RR will suffice.

Resource mobilization	Possible funding support from various sources including the regional bureau. Related risks of current situation should be taken into consideration. Can fund FTAs	TRAC cannot be used No FTA staff can be resourced. ICs and/or service contract are possible. Limitation of quality of service contract v. FTA staff should be considered.
-----------------------	---	--

- Akiko clarified that Engagement Facility modality was originally advised but then Initiation Plan was preferred due to ability to fund FTAs.

II. General comments on the document

- Given current sensitivities in Fiji, language needs to be amended in certain places of the narrative. PAC members (particularly from PC) will provide comments to this effect directly to MCO.
- Justice component may exceed the timeframe. It is a critical component and should have longer term. Concept of “justice” should not be limited to the Western notion of justice but should be defined broader to include restorative justice, alternative dispute resolution etc. so not to lose the contextual perspective.
- The project can start with small scale capacity building component, which related ongoing projects can be linked. Research component of this project can help other on-going projects.

III. Comments on the specific sections

	FEEDBACK PAC Members	RESPONSES Mohammed Mozeem – Governance Analyst
1.	Project period should be written consistently (end date on the cover is 4 September 2015 and end 2015 on the IRRF)	Either September or end 2015 depends on the modality to be decided to take. If IP, it must be one year, September 2015 and can be end 2015 if EF.
2.	II. purpose (p.2) The current paras are too descriptive with background information. The section should focus on the purpose. It can be written in bullet points.	The section will be revised and bullet points will be used.
RRF (Note: EF does not require RRF)		
3.	General advice Check the logical match between baseline and indicators	It will be rechecked.
4.	Project period: as mentioned above comment #1	Refer to the response #1 above.
5.	Output 1: Baseline Clarification was sought if there is no governance reform strategic plan at the	There are at Ministry level but not national government level.

	moment	
6.	<p>Output 2: Indicators</p> <p>Indicators are too ambitious to be achieved by end of the project. Indicators should consider if they are within the project control or outcome level, which take longer time.</p> <p>Suggested language for the indicators:</p> <p>#1 “number of judges with better understanding of ..,”</p> <p>#3 “prepared” instead of “adopted”</p> <p>#5 “number of institutions familiar with the UPR process”</p>	Dyfan will provide language for this part
7.	<p>Output 3: Baseline</p> <p>There are existing Youth Parliaments and existing youth council such as the Community Youth Council and the International Youth Council can be considered. Youth can be recognized as active partner.</p>	<p>There are no active national Youth Parliaments but there is National Youth Council of Fiji. Those existing ones are at CSO level. The project aims to “strengthen structure” at Government level.</p> <p>Ulla will provide language for this part</p>
8.	<p>Output 3: Baseline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarification was sought if “no debate clubs” mean no debate is carried out by youths. ▪ In relation to the indicator 3, quality of debates may need to be measured ▪ Keep the main focus of the project, which is to strengthen governance structure. 	<p>There are debates carried out by youths but there is no “club” as a space where youth can engage in debates. There is no currently organized debate clubs for youths at the moment.</p>
9.	<p>Output 3: Baseline</p> <p>The term “law clinic” may not be clear to mean what the project intends. It should be reflected in the indicators.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although “law clinic” is somehow widely used in UNDP documents as well as in other places like Australia and other developed countries, and there is confusion on the use of the term, it will be defined in the document. ▪ As reflected as indicator #1, “law clinic” established at university level is expected to organize access to justice activities and also community outreach activities as they are mentioned in the target indicated.
10.	<p>Output 3: Target 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It may be considered if “law clinics established in 3 universities” is realistic to achieve. ▪ It was suggested that getting letter of support for project from the USP may work in terms of project support for establishing clinics. 	<p>The meeting with academics during the scoping mission saw a consensus among three universities, and the law clinics should not be confused with law faculties which they already have. This will be defined in the narrative part of the document.</p>
Management Arrangement		

11.	Organizations which are involved in the implementation of the project, such as CSOs could be included in the structure.	CSOs and others who are involved in the project activities will be included as advisory body under UNDP as Project Assurance.
12.	Clarification was sought on Project Manager	International Governance Specialist and National Governance Specialist as Project Manager will be recruited.
13.	Suggestions were made that PC staff who are involved in related projects may be utilized as advisors.	Although the project needs independent project management structure, resources from on-going project will be considered to share the expertise.
14.	Akiko advised that the project aimed to be set a framework to quickly react to needs after the election. Stakeholders have not been exactly identified yet. It may be more useful for us to identify the internal mechanism and arrangement.	Suggested to keep the names of the board representatives general (Gov, UNDP etc.) as UNDP is not sure yet on the specific ministry/entity as counterpart agency.
Monitoring		
15.	Clarification was sought on "The Initiation Plan will be monitored directly by the Deputy Resident Representative". It will be inconsistent to the overall office structure. Suggestion to keep it consistent with current management arrangements used in MCO	This is the format for the Initiation Plan where country directors used to manage Initiation Plans, but this will be changed based on management discussion. To use current management arrangements as per MCO programme management and monitoring.
16.	Quarterly report and end of initiation report are missing in this section.	Quarterly report and end of initiation report to be included.
AWP		
17.	Clarification was sought if annual mean 2014 or one year period.	Although project period will be determined through the modality which is yet to be decided, AWP will be revised and include 2015.
18.	Suggestion was made to shift activity 2 and 3 under the activity result 1 to 2015 AWP	The current AWP will include 2015 and those activities will be included in 2015 AWP.
Other items		
19.	It was suggested that risks analysis could be included in the document. The document can be made broader and include some component from prodoc.	Although the form for EF does not include risk log, risk log will be included for our exercise.

IV. Closing by Asenaca:

- Participants were advised to send their comments and language for specific sections/ items by email.
- The PAC submits the pros and cons of Implementation Plan and Engagement Facility identified during the meeting listed above as recommendation to the senior management team for their decision.

Project Appraisal Committee (PAC)
Meeting Minutes Endorsed by:

..... Date

Ms Asenaca Ravuvu
Assistant Resident Representative - Programme
UNDP Fiji Country Office
PAC Chairperson